

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending in the application. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al. (U.S. 6,507,856 B1) in view of Uhler et al. (U.S. 7,089,560 B1).

Applicants submit the cited references fails to teach or suggest at least a system for generating and communicating to web pages, comprising: a retrieved application handler being registered to an extracted template and an application handler to modify a template and to generate a part of said requested web page and incorporate that part into the template to form the web page (*e.g.*, as described in claim 1).

First, Applicants agree with the Office Action's indication that Chen does not expressly teach a plurality of HTML/XML templates, said retrieved application handler being registered to said extracted template and said application handler to modify said template and to generate a part of a requested web page and incorporate that part into the template to form that web page (as, for example, described in claim 1). *See* Office Action dated 3/5/07, page 5.

The Office Action asserts Uhler discloses the relevant limitations, citing column 14, line 60 – column 15, line 10, without any further particularized assertion of which teachings in the cited section relate to individual elements of claim 1. *See id.* Regardless, Applicants disagree. The cited section states:

FIG. 4 illustrates template 428 and template 430.

The FilterHandler 410 takes content, which is now the contents of the template file, and passes it to the next filter, the Integrate filter 432. Like the Extract filter 420, the Integrate filter 432 uses a set of html/xml templates to process the content. In this case, the Integrate filter 432 takes the original content that has been stored in the Request object Properties object of the FilterHandler 410 by the Extract filter 420, and substitutes it into

the content that was created by the Template filter 408. The resultant content is a combination of the original content with the look and feel template.

The final filter, the Process filter 430, allows one or more templates to process the html/xml, performing XML to HTML conversion in a manner which is consistent with the ultimate consumer of the content.

The cited section describes a FilterHandler 410 takes the *content* of a template file and passes it to an Integrate Filter 432. The Integrate filter takes original content store in the FilterHandler 410 and substitutes it into the content of the Template Filter 408. The Process filter 430 performs the XML to HTML conversion.

Applicants assert the cited section fails to teach or suggest the relevant limitations of claim 1 for multiple reasons. For example, it fails to teach or suggest at least a retrieved application handler being registered to an extracted template (as described in claim 1). In addition, there is no teaching or suggestion of the registered application handler modifying an associated template (also as described in claim 1). Applicants submit that since the cited section fails to teach or suggest at least these relevant limitations, the current rejection of claim 1 under §103 is lacking and should be withdrawn. The §103 rejections of independent claims 7 and 10 are lacking for similar reasons.

Furthermore, Applicants submit the cited references fail to teach or suggest at least a method of communicating between web pages, comprising a destination web page, and data to be received by the destination web page...and displaying a modified XML data element including a template for the destination web page (*e.g.*, as described in claim 13).

First, Applicants agree with the Office Action's indication that Chen fails to expressly teach a destination web page, and data to be received by a destination web page, and modified

XML data including a template for the destination web page. *See* Office Action dated 3/5/07, page 9.

The Office Action asserts Uhler teaches the relevant limitations, citing column 7, lines 20-35, the above-discussed section column 14, line 60 – column 15, line 10, and column 6, lines 1-10. *See* Office Action dated 3/5/07, pages 9-10. Applicants disagree.

First, Applicants wish to point out that claim 13 describe method of communicating between web pages including taking a incoming XML data element from a source web page and modifying it to include a template for a destination web page. Applicants further submit that none of the cited sections of Uhler are directed toward a method of communicating *between* a source web page and a destination web page, even generally. For at least this reason, the cited sections fail to teach or describe the relevant limitations.

In particular, column 7, lines 20-35 of Uhler are directed toward a method for converting an HTTP port into the URL string fragment used to access it, a method for logging, and a method for accepting socket connections. It does not relate to communicating between web pages including taking a incoming XML data element from a source web page and modifying it to include a template for a destination web page.

As discussed above, column 14, line 60 – column 15, line 10 fails to describe the relevant limitations as well.

Finally, column 6, lines 1-10 are directed toward an extension application programming interface that provides dynamic loading, code reuse, and design orthogonality of a single requested web page. It does not relate to communication between a source web page and a destination web page.

Therefore, Applicants submit that since the cited section fails to teach or suggest at least these relevant limitations, the current rejection of claim 13 under §103 is lacking and should be withdrawn. The rejection of independent claim 16 is lacking for similar reasons.

Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, the cited reference fail to support proper §103 rejections of allowable independent claims 1, 7, 10, 13, and 16. Claims 2-6, 8-9, 11-12, 14-15, and 17-18 are allowable for depending from an allowable base claim.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (408) 975-7950 to discuss any matter concerning this application. The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

Respectfully submitted,
KENYON & KENYON LLP

Dated: August 30, 2007

By: /Sumit Bhattacharya/
Sumit Bhattacharya
Reg. No. 51,469

KENYON & KENYON LLP
333 West San Carlos Street
Suite 600
San Jose, CA 95110
(408) 975-7500 telephone
(408) 975-7501 facsimile